

reached the level of severity necessary to meet the Listing in appendix 1.

(4) Amputation of leg at hip.

Nonpermanent impairment refers to a case in which any medical improvement in the person's impairment(s) is possible. This means an impairment for which improvement cannot be predicted based on current experience and the facts of the particular case but which is not at the level of severity of an impairment that is considered permanent. Examples of nonpermanent impairments are: regional enteritis, hyperthyroidism, and chronic ulcerative colitis.

(d) *Frequency of review.* If an annuitant's impairment is expected to improve, generally the Board will review the annuitant's continuing eligibility for disability benefits at intervals from 6 months to 18 months following the Board's most recent decision. The Board's notice to the annuitant about the review of the annuitant's case will tell the annuitant more precisely when the review will be conducted. If the annuitant's disability is not considered permanent but is such that any medical improvement in the annuitant's impairment(s) cannot be accurately predicted, the Board will review the annuitant's continuing eligibility for disability benefits at least once every 3 years. If no medical improvement is expected in the annuitant's impairment(s), the Board will not routinely review the annuitant's continuing eligibility. Regardless of the annuitant's classification, the Board will conduct an immediate continuing disability review if a question of continuing disability is raised pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

(e) *Change in classification of impairment.* If the evidence developed during a continuing disability review demonstrates that the annuitant's impairment has improved, is expected to improve, or has worsened since the last review, the Board may reclassify the annuitant's impairment to reflect this change in severity. A change in the classification of the annuitant's impairment will change the frequency with which the Board will review the case. The Board may also reclassify certain impairments because of improved tests, treatment, and other

technical advances concerning those impairments.

(f) *Review after administrative appeal.* If the annuitant was found eligible to receive or to continue to receive disability benefits on the basis of a decision by a hearings officer, the three-member Board or a Federal court, the agency will not conduct a continuing disability review earlier than 3 years after that decision unless the annuitant's case should be scheduled for a medical improvement expected or vocational reexamination diary review or a question of continuing disability is raised pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

(g) *Waiver of timeframes.* All cases involving a nonpermanent impairment will be reviewed by the Board at least once every 3 years unless the Board determines that the requirements should be waived to ensure that only the appropriate number of cases are reviewed. The appropriate number of cases to be reviewed is to be based on such considerations as the backlog of pending reviews, the projected number of new applications, and projected staffing levels. Therefore, an annuitant's continuing disability review may be delayed longer than 3 years following the Board's original decision or other review under certain circumstances. Such a delay would be based on the Board's need to ensure that backlogs, and new disability claims workloads are accomplished within available medical and other resources and that such reviews are done carefully and accurately.

[56 FR 12980, Mar. 28, 1991, as amended at 65 FR 20372, Apr. 17, 2000]

§ 220.187 If the annuitant's medical recovery was expected and the annuitant returned to work.

If the annuitant's impairment was expected to improve and the annuitant returned to full-time work with no significant medical limitations and acknowledges that medical improvement has occurred, the Board may find that the annuitant's disability ended in the month he or she returned to work. Unless there is evidence showing that the annuitant's disability has not ended, the Board will use the medical and

other evidence already in the annuitant's file and the fact that he or she has returned to full-time work without significant limitations to determine that the annuitant is no longer disabled. (If the annuitant's impairment is not expected to improve, the Board will not ordinarily review his or her claim until the end of the trial work period, as described in §220.170.)

Example: Evidence obtained during the processing of the annuitant's claim showed that the annuitant had an impairment that was expected to improve about 18 months after the annuitant's disability began. The Board, therefore, told the annuitant that his or her claim would be reviewed again at that time. However, before the time arrived for the annuitant's scheduled medical reexamination, the annuitant told the Board that he or she had returned to work and the annuitant's impairment had improved. The Board investigated immediately and found that, in the 16th month after the annuitant's began, the annuitant returned to full-time work without any significant medical restrictions. Therefore, the Board would find that the annuitant's disability ended in the first month the annuitant returned to full-time work.

APPENDIX 1 TO PART 220—LISTING OF IMPAIRMENTS

In the Listing of Impairments, the listings under each separate body system in both Part A and Part B will be effective for periods ranging from 4 to 8 years unless extended or revised and promulgated again. Specifically, the body system listings in the Listing of Impairments will be subject to the following termination dates:

Musculoskeletal system (1.00) within 5 years. Consequently, the listings in this body system will no longer be effective on June 6, 1992.

Respiratory system (3.00) within 6 years. Consequently, the listings in this body system will no longer be effective on December 6, 1991.

The cardiovascular system (4.00) will no longer be effective on June 6, 1991.

The listings under the other body systems in Part A and Part B will expire in 8 years. Consequently, the listing in these body systems will no longer be effective on December 6, 1993. The mental disorders listings in Part A will no longer be effective on August 28, 1991, unless extended by the Board or revised and promulgated again.

Part A

Criteria applicable to individuals age 18 and over and to children under age 18 where criteria are appropriate.
Sec.

- 1.00 Musculoskeletal System.
- 2.00 Special Senses and Speech.
- 3.00 Respiratory System.
- 4.00 Cardiovascular System.
- 5.00 Digestive System.
- 6.00 Genito-Urinary System.
- 7.00 Hemic and Lymphatic System.
- 8.00 Skin.
- 9.00 Endocrine System.
- 10.00 Multiple Body Systems.
- 11.00 Neurological.
- 12.00 Mental Disorders.
- 13.00 Neoplastic Diseases, Malignant.

1.00 MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM

A. *Loss of function* may be due to amputation or deformity. Pain may be an important factor in causing functional loss, but it must be associated with relevant abnormal signs or laboratory findings. Evaluations of musculoskeletal impairments should be supported where applicable by detailed descriptions of the joints, including ranges of motion, condition of the musculature, sensory or reflex changes, circulatory deficits, and X-ray abnormalities.

B. *Disorders of the spine*, associated with vertebrogenic disorders as in 1.05C, result in impairment because of distortion of the bony and ligamentous architecture of the spine or impingement of a herniated nucleus pulposus or bulging annulus on a nerve root. Impairment caused by such abnormalities usually improves with time or responds to treatment. Appropriate abnormal physical findings must be shown to persist on repeated examinations despite therapy for a reasonable presumption to be made that severe impairment will last for a continuous period of 12 months. This may occur in cases with unsuccessful prior surgical treatment.

Evaluation of the impairment caused by disorders of the spine requires that a clinical diagnosis of the entity to be evaluated first must be established on the basis of adequate history, physical examination, and roentgenograms. The specific findings stated in 1.05C represent the level required for that impairment; these findings, by themselves, are not intended to represent the basis for establishing the clinical diagnosis. Furthermore, while neurological examination findings are required, they are not to be interpreted as a basis for evaluating the magnitude of any neurological impairment. Neurological impairments are to be evaluated under 11.00-11.19.

The history must include a detailed description of the character, location, and radiation of pain; mechanical factors which incite and relieve pain; prescribed treatment, including type, dose, and frequency of analgesic; and typical daily activities. Care must be taken to ascertain that the reported examination findings are consistent with the individual's daily activities.